

REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 6-10, 13-15, 18-23, 25-29, 31-32 and 34-36 are all the claims pending in the application.

Statement of Substance of Interview

As an initial matter, Applicants thank the Examiner for the courtesies extended during the interview conducted on September 19, 2007. In view of the helpful comments provided by the Examiner during the interview, and to expedite prosecution of the instant application, claims 1-3, 6-8, 13, 18-20, 25-28, 31, and 34-36 have been amended. Applicants respectfully submit that the amendments place the application in immediate condition for allowance, as discussed in further detail below with respect to the prior art rejection of the claims and as preliminarily agreed to by the Examiner subject to further consideration and/or search.

It is respectfully submitted that the instant STATEMENT OF SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW complies with the requirements of 37 C.F.R. §§1.2 and 1.133 and MPEP §713.04.

Claim Rejections –35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 6-7, 18-19, and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the enablement requirement. In particular, the Examiner contends that the Applicants' Specification does not provide support for "the predetermined order is not dictated by order of receipt of objects" as set forth in claim 6. For *at least* the following reasons, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

The Examiner acknowledges that “support is provided for the order not necessarily being the order they are received from the server” (Office Action, page 3, lines 2-5, emphasis added).

The MPEP, in § 2164.04 states that [i]n order to make a rejection, the examiner has the initial burden to establish a reasonable basis to question the enablement provided for the claimed invention. *In re Wright*, 999 F.2d 1557, 1562, 27 USPQ2d 1510, 1513 (Fed. Cir. 1993) (examiner must provide a reasonable explanation as to why the scope of protection provided by a claim is not adequately enabled by the disclosure). Here, no reasonable basis has been established since the Examiner concedes that the Specification provides support for the outputting or displaying order of the objects not necessarily being the order the objected are received from the server.

It is at least inherent that if the Specification provides support for outputting or displaying the objects in an order that is not necessarily the order the objects were received, the Specification then also supports that the order for outputting or displaying the objects is not dictated by the order of receipt of the objects. Also, such an order for outputting or displaying the objects can be predetermined since the predetermined order is indicated or provided in the response message received from the server, and the server would inherently have knowledge of the predetermined order when indicating or providing the predetermined order in the response message.

In light of the discussion above, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 6-7, 18-19, and 27 comply with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112. Moreover, claims 6-7, 18-19 and 27 have been amended to further clarify the claimed subject matter. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the 35 U.S.C. § 112 rejection.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-3, 13-15, 25-26, and 34-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,283,711 to Halpern *et al.* (“Halpern”) in view of the Applicants’ admitted prior art (“AAPA”). For *at least* the following reasons, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is patentable over Halpern, the AAPA, or any conceivable combination thereof. For example, amended claim 1 relates to a method of requesting and processing a plurality of objects from a server. The method comprises, *inter alia*:

- *opening a session with at least one server,*
- *searching in the at least one server for an information element based upon a search criteria after the opening of the session with the at least one server,*
- *receiving from at least one server search results displayable on a web page comprising a list identifying occurrences of the information element, wherein at least some of said occurrences of the information element identify objects,*
- *generating for at least two identified objects, requests to the at least one server for obtaining the at least two objects,*
- *packing the plurality of requests for the at least two objects into a packed request message and transmitting the packed request message to the at least one server,*
- *receiving a response message from the at least one server, the response message containing the at least two objects packed into the response message,*
- *ending the session with the at least one server after the receiving the response message.*

That is, the searching, receiving search results, generating, packing, and receiving the response message are all carried out within a session opened with the at least one server. As discussed during the interview, the prior art of record does not disclose or suggest this feature.

For instance, Halpern is directed to a method for installing a subset of software components and data files in a distributed processing network. Prior to delivering an installation package to a requesting end user, the package is custom configured at a remote server, in response to the user's inputs (*see* Halpern: Abstract, FIGS. 2-3, col. 7, lines 1-56). However, Halpern is altogether silent regarding carrying out all the operations from engaging in a dialog with the options manager (Halpern, FIG. 2, step 2) to the packager transmitting the desired package to the client system (Halpern, FIG. 3, step 14), within one session.

The AAPA does not cure the deficient teachings of Halpern. Applicants further submit that the present invention was conceived *at least* due to these deficiencies in the AAPA.

As such, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is patentable over the combination of Halpern and the AAPA.

Claims 13, 25, and 36 recite some variation of the features discussed above with respect to claim 1. Therefore, claims 13, 25, and 36 are patentable for reasons similar to those given above with respect to claim 1.

Claims 2-3, 14-15, 26, and 34-35 are patentable *at least* by virtue of their dependency on independent claims 1, 13, and 25.

Claims 6-10, 18-23, 27-29, 31, and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,283,711 to Halpern *et al.* (“Halpern”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,075,943 to Feinman, and further in view of the Applicants’ admitted prior art (“AAPA”). For *at least* the following reasons, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Applicants respectfully submit claim 8 is patentable over the combination of Halpern, Feinman, and the AAPA. For example, claim 8 relates to a method of transferring a plurality of objects from a server to a client. The method comprises, *inter alia*, automatically packing the retrieved plurality of objects into a response message, and transmitting the response message to the client. The *response message comprises an indicator* of a first order in which the packed objects are to be *displayed*, wherein *the first order is not dictated by the order in which the plurality of the objects are automatically packed*.

The Examiner acknowledges that Halpern and the AAPA do not disclose the above-noted features of claim 8. However, the Examiner contends that Feinman makes up for the deficient teachings of Halpern and the AAPA. Specifically, the Examiner contends that col. 3, line 43 to col. 4, line 12 of Feinman disclose this feature. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Feinman is directed to a system and method for remotely transferring and installing client server application programs from a source computer onto a remote client within a data processing system (*see* Feinman: Abstract and FIG. 1A). In the cited portions of Feinman, Feinman describes a sequential file 100 that is used to identify a remote client’s delivery points. The sequential file 100 is shown in FIG. 7 of Feinman. However, there is no disclosure in

Feinman that this sequential file 100 is part of the compressed file being sent to the client (Feinman, FIG. 1A, step 20, and FIG. 5, step 64). On the other hand, claim 8 recites that the *response message (sent to the client) comprises an indicator of a first order in which the packed objects are to be displayed.*

Feinman discloses that the automatic installation system runs on the source computer (col. 2, lines 47-48). As shown in FIG. 7, the sequential file contains a DELIVERY POINT 118 field. This field contains the name of the remote delivery point, i.e., “the remote computer onto which the compressed file will be transferred and the installation performed” (*see* Feinman, FIG. 7). Moreover, the sequential file 100 contains a TARGET INFORMATION 120 field, which includes a login id and login password for logging into the delivery point (i.e., the target remote computer). Since the automatic installation system resides on the source computer, it follows that the sequential file 100 also resides on the source computer, because the automatic installation system uses the information in the sequential file 100 to determine a target remote computer to which the compressed file will be delivered, and also uses the login information included in the sequential file 100 to login to the target remote computer. Therefore, Feinman does not disclose or suggest that the compressed file sent to the client comprises the sequential file 100.

Furthermore, the sequential file 100 contains information regarding delivery information (as discussed above) of the compressed file and when to install (DATE TO INSTALL 110 AND TIME TO INSTALL 112 fields) the compressed file. However, the sequential file 100 does not

disclose or suggest a first order in which the multiple subdirectories (that make up the compressed file, see col. 3, lines 20-25 of Feinman) are to be ***displayed***, much less disclosing that *the first order is **not dictated** by the order in which the multiple subdirectories are automatically packed*. Even assuming *arguendo* that the installation of application programs suggests displaying the application programs, Feinman is altogether silent regarding any characteristics of the order in which application programs are to be installed relative to the order in which they are transmitted to the client computer.

In light of the discussion above, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 8 is patentable over any conceivable combination of Halpern, Feinman, and the AAPA. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claim 8.

Claims 6-7, 18-19, and 27 depend from claims 1, 13, and 25. Since Feinman does not cure the deficient teachings of Halpern and the AAPA with respect claims 1, 13, and 25, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 6-7, 18-19, and 27 are patentable *at least* by virtue of their dependency.

Moreover, claims 6-7, 18-19, and 27 recite some variation of the features discussed above with respect to claim 8. Therefore, they are patentable for reasons similar to those discussed above with respect to claim 8.

Claims 20, 28, and 31 also recite some variation of the features discussed above with respect to claim 8. Therefore, claims 20, 28, and 31 patentable for reasons similar to those discussed above with respect to claim 8.

Claims 9-10, 21-23, 29 and 32 are patentable *at least* by virtue of their dependency on independent claims 8, 20, 28, and 31, respectively.

Applicants further submit claim 31 is patentable over the prior art of record for reasons other than reciting features similar to those discussed above with respect to claim 8. For example, claim 31 relates to a method of transferring a plurality of objects from a server to a client comprising, *inter alia*, *receiving* a request from the client for the plurality of objects, and *retrieving* from an object store a packed object having a plurality of objects corresponding to the requested plurality of objects. The plurality of objects are packed into the packed object prior to receiving the request for the plurality of objects.

The Examiner cites cols. 5 and 6 of Halpern as allegedly disclosing the receiving step and the retrieving step. However, the Examiner does not address the above-noted feature of claim 31 regarding the plurality of objects being packed into the packed object prior to receiving the request (from the client) for the plurality of objects. Applicants respectfully submit that Halpern, or the other prior art of record, does not disclose or suggest at least this unique feature of claim 31.

In Halpern, a user selects components and options of a software suite that interest him/her (Halpern, col. 5, lines 43-48, col. 7, lines 22-23). These selected components and options are subsequently packed by a packager 110 to create a custom installation package (Halpern, col. 6, lines 5-10, and col. 7, lines 32-34). Nowhere in Halpern is it disclosed that this custom installation package is created prior to the user selecting desired components and options.

Feinman and the AAPA do not cure these deficient teachings of Halpern.

For at least this additional exemplary reason, claim 31 is patentable over Halpern, Feinman, and the AAPA combination.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. **If any points remain in issue, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned agent at the telephone number listed below.**

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111 AND
STATEMENT OF SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW
U.S. Application No.: 09/986,248

Attorney Docket No. A8506

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Quadeer A. Ahmed
Registration No. 60,835

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON DC SUGHRUE/142133

46159

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: October 16, 2007